The Ford International Weekly

THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT

Published by

THE DEARBORN PUBLISHING CO.

Dearborn, Michigan

HENRY FORD, President.
C. J. FORD, Vice President.
E. B. FORD, Secretary-Treasurer.
E. G. PIPP, Editor.

Twentieth Year, Number 22, March 27, 1920.

The price of subscription in the United States and its possessions is One Dollar a year; in Canada, One Dollar and Fifty Cents; and in other countries, Two Dollars. Single Copy, Five Cents.

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Post Office at Dearborn, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

The President's Stand

IN ONE of the strongest documents of his Presidency, Mr. Wilson has affirmed his uncompromising support of Article X of the League of Nations Covenant. This is the article which pledges the member nations to respect, and to preserve against aggression from without, the territorial integrity and political independence of the nations included in the League. The President says that the enemies of the League have followed a true instinct in concentrating their attacks on Article X, "for it is undoubtedly the foundation of the whole structure."

The President's contention is sound. Article X *is* the foundation and security of the League. If the members of the League do not agree to stand together to maintain its integrity, it will never attain a vital existence; it will sink to the level of a debating council to which the nations will send their literary and idealist statesmen instead of the men who are able to say, "we will do this or that." Lacking Article X the Covenant will resemble a municipal ordinance in a city that has no police. The principle would be announced, but it would not be actualized.

Even the opponents of the Article will admit that much. Their contention against it is that they are not so interested in the establishment and maintenance of the League as in safeguarding the interests of the United States. They freely admit that the League would require the pledge of force on the part of its members to maintain League conditions in the world; "but," they say, "we don't want to pledge the force of America. We don't want to be in a position where we shall be under moral obligations to interfere to prevent aggression elsewhere in the world. This may be a fine thing for Humanity, but is it a fine thing for the United States?"

The President meets this contention squarely when he asks senators to put humanity above special national interests: "If I had the opportunity I would beg every one concerned to consider the matter in the light of what it is possible to accomplish for humanity rather than in the light of special national interests." Surely the lesser is contained in the greater, the good of the United States in the good of humanity; but apparently there are senators and others who do not think so.

For the first time the President makes mention of the forces he had to fight in the Peace Conference. The imperialists and militarists are against the League in all its articles. In France, he says, the friends of the League were able to defeat the militarists, "but they are in control now." In spite of that, and before the militarists could destroy the situation, France adhered to the League.

In this connection the President very powerfully emphasizes the renunciations which the imperialistic nations have made in order to accept Article X. Aggression has been their life. Their diplomacy was built upon the idea of conquest. Until the United States suggested the League, and obtained the moral support of the peoples of the world for the League, the imperialistic nations saw no other course than to continue the old game. The war itself was an imperialistic war, and imperialistic designs made their appearance at the very Peace Table and caused all the difficulties that were experienced there. Now, says the President in substance, these avowed imperialists have renounced their imperialism in order to constitute such a League as the United States has suggested. They have said one by one that they will renounce all aggression, not only renounce it for themselves but resist it when made by others upon any member of the League. Shall the United States, the nation that has never been stained by wrong ambitions—shall the United States, which has nothing of this kind to renounce, refuse to enter the League with a pledge to support the new order?

We shall have to enter the League as a full sharer in the responsibility of maintaining it, says the President, or we shall have to retire "from the great council of powers by which the world was saved."

There still remains the question of whether, without the United States, there ever will be a League of Nations. The League was American in its inception and program. Without the constant impulse of American ideas, can the League become in any degree a realization of the common peoples' hopes? It is very doubtful.

The Silent Struggle in Japan

IT HAS become the habit to consider Japan so far dominating her part of the world that the possibility of her sharing, with her Western compeers, the pains and weaknesses contingent on evolutionary processes, escapes us.

We have come to believe that she is the one cohesive power, strongly-welded, undisturbed by dissension, strong-handed, strong-ruled, and strong-purposed; she, alone in the world, has nothing to do but look around and see where she shall put her foot next. If we don't believe that, we certainly talk as if we did.

Some twelve months ago THE DEARBORN INDEPENDENT published an analysis of the governments of the world, in which the government of Japan loomed up, with surprising abruptness, as easily the most autocratic—un-democratic—rule among great peoples. Only a few semi-civilized peoples remained in a similar condition. It was pointed out that, under a form of constitution modeled on that of the German Empire, and granted craftily by the Mikado in 1889, the Premier or Minister President of State is responsible not to the Imperial Diet, but to the Mikado who alone can appoint and remove him. It was indicated further how the Mikado himself is a screen behind which is a powerful group of aristocrats known as the "elder statesmen," who actually control the government.

It can scarcely be necessary to do more than allude to the tremendous wave in favor of really popular government that has swept the world during the past five years. Not just here and there, but in every land; not just a cause in the mouths of a few ardent disciples and their leaders, but a matter of common conversation in the mouths of the great public. How was it to be expected that such a changed viewpoint, apparent in France, Britain, Italy, everywhere—in changed suffrage relations—could fail to appear in Japan?

It has, of course, and while the world has been picturing Japan as the one untroubled power, that country has, in fact, been engaged in a silent, desperate struggle to maintain her aristocratic supremacy over the new liberal movement. The appointment of Kei Hara was at once a concession and a victory; a concession by the ruling group; a ruler by the Liberals. What mattered it, thought the elder statesmen, who was premier, since he was a servant of the Mikado, and they were, in actual fact, the Mikado?

But once Hara was in, he spoke his mind and stood fast by his Liberal colors—and they couldn't put him out. They and the Mikado were helpless. When Hara marched into the government as premier, the Liberal tide rolled up strongly behind him to the steps of his office and the Mikado's palace. There was no sweeping back the sea.

After two and a half years of inactive existence the Japanese Diet met last Christmas Day for its first business session since its election two years before. The reason for its enforced idleness was obvious in its first business. It moved for an extension of the franchise. The government headed by Hara, anxious as it was for reforms, could not undertake to go so far as the Diet wished. And so suddenly did the parties gather to the new idea of an extended suffrage that the Premier was forced to ask the Mikado to dissolve the Diet, to save a complete collapse. So the Diet which lived two and a half years, never did a stroke of business.

The Constitution says a new election must be held within five months, and throughout Japan the parties are gathering, a newly-organized Socialist movement, a quiet but hearty Labor movement, several reform movements, all, however, united in a common viewpoint—the viewpoint of the modern world—democracy, real, genuine, hundred per cent man-for-man democracy.

It is barely possible we have been mistaken; Japan as a tremendous, impregnable world-power may be nothing more than a bogie of our imagination. Like the rest of the world she has her wayward children, who insist on thinking for themselves. And the Japanese public has never been afraid to speak its mind and strike a blow for its purposes when necessary.

Japan has her troubles.

Australia Welcomes Immigrants

THE cycle of immigration is found in two contemporary statements by two distinguished leaders in two of Britain's overseas dominions. Mark Sheldon, high commissioner in the United States for Australia, recently told a New York gathering that Australia "could find employment almost overnight for another 10,000,000" over Australia's present population of 5,000,000. The additional population, said Mr. Sheldon, would give a tremendous increase to production, and incidentally help to restore the equilibrium of exchange.

Sir Andrew Macphail, of Montreal, on the other hand, speaking to the Canadian Club of Ottawa, almost on the same day, denounced the practice of advertising for the purpose of obtaining immigration of all sorts and conditions of people and added that Canada was scrutinizing her immigrants closely and, in fact, closed the gates on 20,000 persons last year.

Australia is at the beginning of the cycle, Canada at the end. Both Mr. Sheldon and Sir Andrew Macphail are, in a measure, right, although Mr. Sheldon is on the most generally favorable ground. Theoretically immigration includes "all sorts and conditions of people," and any man or woman is a welcome citizen in prospect, providing good character is established. In the United States we rather pride ourselves on that very quality of our freedom, and can contemplate the soil of the country as literally seeded over and plowed in with "all sorts and conditions of people." From that assimilated mass we get Americanism.

But from that mass Sir Andrew does not get Canadianism. On the other hand he denies the efficacy of the "melting pot," and argues, somewhat pessimistically, that the "lower race always prevails." If this argument were true, it would mean that American citizenship today represents the lowest strata of our immigration, a conclusion manifestly absurd, since, despite the fluid element of un-assimilated aliens, the bulk of alien immigration, after arrival, tends distinctly upward. The average level of arrival is high, not low.

However Canada's problem is different from ours. When the United States was peopling the West there was no hardy and experienced neighbor close at hand. Canada is part of the civilized Americas; even her wide spaces cannot remove the actual presence and spirit of established society which effectually broods over the whole continent. Canada, in the view of Sir Andrew at least, has enough to go on with, is in no rush to people her billowing provinces, but can afford to pick and choose a high type of immigrant. A splendid theory, of course, and one in which we can wish Sir Andrew well.

Australia, distant so many days over the Pacific, comes more nearly home in experience to the United States. Australia's surrounding ocean is no greater isolation than was the surrounding uninhabited lands which spread out on every side of the pioneering Americans. Australia has pioneering to do; can, as Mr. Sheldon says, take care of 10,000,000 strangers almost over-night; and could, although Mr. Sheldon doesn't say so, give them each a fine farm, and turn to welcome 10,000,000 more.

Australia is a country of the worker, and is willing to take a chance, just as America took a chance when she opened the Gate of Liberty to tired and cramped Europeans. It is a country of hard knocks, blunt words and a certain rugged quality which keeps the health rate high and the death rate low.

The day may come when Australia will feel itself arrived at Canada's settled state, and guard her doors with careful scrutiny. But at present we can, if we choose to watch, behold a replica of our own great drama unfolding in the South Pacific, with almost as tremendous a possibility of development. Australia, like Alaska, has only been scratched on the surface.

The untutored savage will easier believe the story of Jonah than the story of the Wright brothers.

Tell all you know, if you wish, but in the name of Justice do not tell more than you know.

The wife of a mean man is shabby. The wife of a fool is overdressed.

Tears of love are pearls. Tears of envy are—salt water.

It is more difficult to appear honest than to really be so.

The romances in books are but the shadow of those in life.

Between sin and hypocrisy, choose sin as the lesser evil.

An uncorrected mistake leads to many more.